

## **Spirituality and equality**

**BERNARD MOSS**

Professor of Social Work Education and Spirituality, Staffordshire University, United Kingdom

**NEIL THOMPSON**

Director, Avenue Consulting Ltd, United Kingdom

### **Abstract**

There has been a focus on equality in social and public policy for some considerable time now, with the emphasis more recently on valuing diversity. However, the significance of spirituality has tended to be neglected, but is now experiencing a resurgence of interest and is receiving increasing attention. This paper seeks to combine the two important areas by exploring the interrelationships between spirituality and equality – two vitally important aspects of social work and social policy. PCS analysis (Thompson, 2003) is used as a framework for connecting the two fields of study. The focus is on social work education, but the paper has implications more broadly for the social and public policy field.

### **Introduction**

The emergence of spirituality as an issue of increasing importance and significance for social work has been a recent phenomenon in the UK (Moss, 2005). In the United States and Canada, however, it has been firmly on the agenda for many years, as Sheridan (2004: 6) observes:

The social work profession has been witnessing a renewed interest in the role of spirituality in both social work practice and education since the 1980s after a long period of distancing itself from its sectarian roots ...

The reasons for this are complex, and not just to do with the cultural differences between the UK and the United States with regard to religious and spiritual issues. As a concept spirituality is not easy to define; it is not always clear what distinctions should be drawn between spirituality and religion; there are deep suspicions about certain aspects of religion (and by association, spirituality) and the negative influence it can have upon people's lives; and many social workers would regard it as a 'no go' area, best left to the religious professionals.

Alongside these reservations, however, there is evidence in the UK 2001 Census (however difficult it may be to interpret the data) that some 70 per cent of people in Britain claim to believe in God or a similar higher power (Census 2001; see also Bruce, 1995). Furthermore, Holloway (2005: 11) notes that:

There is a growing interest in spiritual need and spiritual care amongst health and social care professionals internationally, as part of holistic person-centred care (McSherry, 1998; Parsloe, 1999). Attention to the spiritual (or existential) dimension of health and well-being is currently being driven by evidence from epidemiological studies demonstrating positive health effects of spirituality (Chatters, 2000; Crowther *et al.* 2002). Many health professionals express dissatisfaction that the disease-orientated consumerist medical care system frequently ignores patients' spiritual needs important to their health and well-being (Wright, 2002).

It is worth reminding ourselves, however, that for all its commitment to holistic, person-centred care, social work has for a long time felt uneasy about its origins and roots within religious philanthropy. Many people originally came into social work and similar professions as a direct result of their religious faith; indeed, their commitment to serve others unreservedly and unconditionally arose from their religious allegiance. (Bowpitt, 1998). This did not mean that they hoped to use their professional practice as a means for proselytising or acting unethically, but it did reflect the value base that lay at the heart of their religious faith which they sought to put to practical use within a professional, caring framework.

On its all-important journey towards attaining professional status, and gaining academic respectability and acceptance as a discipline, however, social work began to 'slip the ropes' from the jetty of its origins. The seminal influence of Freud and Marx made a significant impact upon the theoretical and practical nature of social work, seeming to undermine the validity of many claims for religious authenticity and belief in a divine being. The ways in which religious influences were seen to have a negative impact upon individuals and communities received significant attention in the (then) new academic disciplines of sociology and psychology, thereby throwing the whole 'religious enterprise' into disrepute. The examples of religious 'systems' at times discriminating against women, and upholding patriarchal oppression, caused great affront to social work theoreticians and practitioners, whose value base of anti-discriminatory practice was (and still is) of paramount importance. In recent times, the examples of religiously inspired homophobia has added another nail in the coffin of religion as far as many practitioners and academics are concerned. All in all, religion has been seen to be 'part of the problem', and to be either vigorously eschewed, or quietly ignored (Moss 2005).

Canda and Furman (1999) in the USA, together with Bowpitt (1998), Holloway (2005), Moss (2005) and others in the UK, however, have been seeking to bring social work back to a more balanced middle ground in its understanding of these issues. While there is no attempt whatsoever to deny the negative influences of religion – indeed, the profession is totally committed to challenging any discriminatory and oppressive practice or worldview – we are beginning to recognise that, for many people, their religion provides a worldview that helps them make sense of their lives, as well as fostering

resilience in the face of disaster and providing a motivation to care for others. Religious faith still motivates people to become social workers and to join a helping profession. Furthermore, recent legislation obliges social workers to take the religious views of the service users with utmost seriousness (Moss, 2005).

Where the contemporary debate differs from the previous approach is in its understanding that the issue is far wider than religion. Indeed, religious faith, belief and commitment may be seen to be one variation of how spirituality is now being understood. Spirituality may not be the most attractive term to use – indeed for some it may be quite off putting – but at root it is expressing something important that is at the core of each and every human being, whether or not they subscribe to a religious faith. This involves the search for meaning and purpose, and a worldview which helps them make sense of themselves and others. It is this broader, inclusive understanding of spirituality that is helping social work realise that its previous unwillingness to accept that a religious faith was a positive, life-enhancing phenomenon for some people was somewhat wide of the mark.

The current interest in spirituality is wider than social work, however. In a recent report from the Roffey Park Institute in the UK, Holbeche and Springett (2004) explore issues of spirituality and meaning making in the workplace, and report findings that such issues were of enormous importance, not just to worker satisfaction, but also to overall productivity (Moss, 2004). There are also links to be made with the important work of Zohar and Marshall (2000: 3-4) who have developed the concept of ‘spiritual intelligence’, to complement and enrich previous theorising about emotional intelligence and IQ. They use this term to refer to the ability to find meaning in what we do, particularly in a work context. They refer to spiritual intelligence as:

the intelligence with which we address and solve problems of meaning and value, the intelligence with which we can place our actions and our lives in a wider, richer, meaning-giving context, the intelligence with which we can assess that one course of action or one life-path is more meaningful than another.

In a later work, Zohar and Marshall (2004: 2) write of the related notion of ‘spiritual capital’. They define wealth as ‘that which we have access to that enhances the quality of life’ and then go on to bemoan the fact that wealth tends to be seen primarily in financial terms. They then proceed to make the important point that:

Spiritual capital, by contrast, is wealth that we can live by, wealth that enriches the deeper aspects of our lives. It is wealth we gain through drawing upon the deepest meanings, deepest values, most fundamental purposes and highest motivations, and by finding a way to embed these in our lives and work. (Zohar and Marshall 2004: 3)

The concept of emotional intelligence, out of which Zohar and Marshall’s work has grown. has been criticised for relying on biological reductionism and for ‘commodification’ – that is, for being used as a tool for generating training and consultancy opportunities in the corporate world (see, for example, Fineman, 2002). Similar criticisms could be levelled at the notion of spiritual intelligence to a certain

extent at least. For example, Zohar and Marshall (2004: 3 emphasis added) describe spiritual intelligence as ‘our moral intelligence, giving us an *innate* ability to distinguish right from wrong’. No room here, then, for social or cultural factors in shaping morality. However, despite these significant flaws, it does not alter the fact that spiritual intelligence and spiritual capital can be seen as important concepts that help to draw attention to the importance of spirituality and associated processes of meaning making.

These are some of the developments that have brought the issue of spirituality into greater focus. They underline the importance of the contribution it can make to the debate about issues of equality and diversity.

### **Equality issues in professional education**

Equality issues have been a central feature of social work education in the UK for over two decades now, and are increasingly taking centre stage in health care education (see, for example, Baxter, 2001). Such matters have not always been handled with the sensitivity they deserve, and can be criticized for adopting at times a reductionist approach that fails to do justice to the complexities involved (see Thompson, 2005a for a discussion of this). In particular, some oversimplified approaches, in their drive to draw attention to wider structural factors, have tended to lose sight of the person at the heart of it all. This is clearly not an approach that is consistent with a perspective premised on the central role of spirituality in people’s lives. It is therefore essential that efforts to address equality and value diversity are sufficiently sophisticated to take account of the intricacies involved.

One such approach is what is known as PCS analysis (introduced in Thompson, 1993, and more fully developed in Thompson, 2003). The focal point of this framework is the recognition that discrimination operates at three separate but interconnected levels: **personal, cultural and structural**. It is now an extensively used and widely cited analytical framework for helping to make sense of, and address, discrimination and inequality.

However, Moss (2005) makes the point that there is much to be gained by adding the ‘dimension’ of spirituality to this, thereby developing it into a ‘PCSS’ analysis, with the additional ‘S’ referring to spiritual perspectives. Just as in the original model where the cultural and structural contexts enrich and develop our understanding of the personal, so the spiritual ‘dimension’ further deepens and enriches the analysis. It is not a case of these dimensions being mutually exclusive: each widening circle of understanding penetrates and illuminates the circle(s) it encompasses. By proposing this development of PCS analysis, Moss is suggesting that the aspect of spirituality that involves, amongst other things, ‘meaning making’ in people’s lives, is given full emphasis, by highlighting the significance of the spiritual at the personal, cultural and structural levels, as well as safeguarding the contribution religious perspectives, as a subset of spirituality, can bring to the debate.

This paper recognizes the significance of the spiritual dimension, and seeks to explore in more depth the ways in which spiritual perspectives can be integrated into all three levels of PCS analysis. We shall therefore provide a summary of PCS analysis and then, for each of the three levels, seek to incorporate the spiritual aspects. What we shall produce, then, is not a detailed development of an alternative framework (PCSS), but

rather an enriched and enhanced version of PCS analysis that seeks to take full account of the contribution spirituality can make to it. We begin with a discussion of why the rediscovery of spirituality is such an important and welcome development.

### **Rediscovering spirituality**

We mentioned in the introduction some of the reasons why some people have regarded the resurgent interest in spirituality with some suspicion. Not least among these reasons is the issue of definition. Whereas with religion we feel that we have at least some understanding of what is meant, especially in areas where many faith communities may flourish and command the allegiance of significant numbers of people, spirituality is far more fluid. It seems to mean different things to different people. Moreover, it seems to have, in some people's minds, a very individualistic 'flavour' that makes it difficult to categorize and understand. For one person it is about practising yoga and meditation; for another it is about communing with nature; for someone else it may be about surrounding themselves with all the latest technological wizardry to help them enjoy and feel in control of things; for others it is about enhancing their life experience with mood-enhancing substances. There are clearly many variations on what spirituality can mean.

Four points deserve mentioning here. First, there is a sense in which spirituality is all about what makes an individual person 'tick'; what 'turns them on' and 'what gives them a sense of well-being'. It is inevitable, therefore, that each person *will* have an individual 'take' on their personal spirituality – that is, what makes us unique, and what gives us our own sense of meaning and purpose in life. People involved in social work have known this for a very long time when they have talked about valuing the individual – it is simply that they have not used the word spirituality to describe it. In other words, the apparent 'looseness' of the concept is also part of its strength.

This means that, secondly, this can be a term that *everyone* can own, and can make their own. Admittedly, for people with a religious affiliation and belief there will be distinctive common experiences and practices for which the term spirituality is appropriate. But, in a wider sense, spirituality is a common denominator for everyone's humanity, whether or not they have a religious belief. Moss (2005), for instance, argues that a person's spirituality is closely linked with the worldview they hold in order to make sense of their lives and the world they inhabit. The efficacy of a person's worldview is often put to the test when major problems or tragedies strike, but it will be precisely in this ongoing journey towards meaning that a person's spirituality will emerge.

Thirdly, there is nothing sacrosanct about the term. Some prefer to use the phrase 'well-being' as an alternative to spirituality, arguing that it avoids some of the unwelcome associations with religion. What this emphasizes is that 'spirituality' is something of what Merchant and Bawn (2005) call a 'gateway' term: in other words, it opens up for us a dimension of what it means to be human that is not contained elsewhere in other discourses. Holloway (2005: 3) provides an insight into this when she comments that social workers need to be:

mindful of our core values and skills ... I actually think that there is a very real danger currently of social work losing that enduring core, and it has to do with the latest trend on public services bearing down on social work.

Holloway is echoing the plea made by Canda and Furman (1999) to recognize and respect the 'helping heart' of social work, and not to let it become downgraded into a mechanistic form-filling enterprise. The title of their book, 'Spirituality: the heart of helping' encapsulates this; they argue that that an awareness of spirituality will help to protect the core values of social work by valuing the nurturing the individual 'spirit' of everyone who comes into their professional care.

Finally, it needs to be argued that a full understanding of spirituality needs the cultural and structural perspectives to complement the personal. Moss (2005), for instance, suggests that the dimension of social justice is a crucial litmus test for spirituality, without which the concept runs the risk of becoming self-absorbed and narcissistic. For those working in social work, this dimension to spirituality also involves a strong link with the values of anti-discriminatory practice, with its challenge to anything that demeans, devalues, or dehumanizes those with whom they are called to work.

From this brief discussion it is possible to see that, far from being a marginalized or marginalizing concept, spirituality is taking us into the very heart of the contemporary debate about equality and diversity, with its emphasis upon ways in which the celebration of individual uniqueness and diversity can enhance a community's richness.

### **Spirituality and the equality agenda**

A renewed emphasis on spirituality, we would therefore argue, is entirely consistent with a commitment to promoting equality and valuing diversity. The importance of equality issues for spirituality is evidenced by the fact that inequality and discrimination can clearly stand in the way of spiritual fulfilment. The demeaning and undermining effects of discrimination, while at times contributing to the development of resilience, can have very detrimental effects on a person's self-esteem and overall well-being. Indeed, social justice can be seen as an important value underpinning both the equality agenda and approaches to spirituality that recognize the importance of 'connectedness' – that is, of what Heidegger (1962) called 'being-in-the-world'.

Valuing diversity is particularly well suited to a renewed emphasis on spirituality, as both are concerned with valuing people for what they bring and not 'pigeonholing' people according to unhelpful and often discriminatory categories. Also in terms of diversity, the wide variety of religious and spiritual worldviews to be encountered in contemporary society is clearly a very relevant issue (or set of issues) for theory, policy and practice. To seek to address diversity issues without taking on board the spiritual dimension is to neglect a key aspect of the subject.

### ***PCS analysis***

PCS analysis has become a widely used analytical framework in the education and training of human services workers (see Thompson, 2005b). While Thompson's work in this area is not antithetical to the spiritual dimension, it does not address it explicitly. Our task here, therefore, is to revisit PCS analysis and weave into each of the three levels a consideration of the role of spirituality.

PCS analysis was developed as a response to oversimplified approaches to discrimination and oppression that were largely one-dimensional, focusing on either personal prejudice almost exclusively or emphasizing social structural factors without adequately theorizing how structural factors shape and constrain actions at the individual level. It was put forward as an alternative to such oversimplified views that failed to appreciate the complex interactions between the individual, personal level and the wider structural context, as recognized in structuration theory in sociology (Stones, 2005) and existentialism in philosophy (Sartre, 1963). These oversimplified approaches also neglected the cultural level. They failed to recognize that the interactions between individuals and wider structural factors are generally mediated by a complex, multidimensional cultural context of shared meanings, unwritten rules and taken-for-granted assumptions (what sociologists often refer to as 'sedimented meanings').

Discrimination, according to PCS analysis, arises as a complex set of interactions involving personal factors (beliefs, assumptions and prejudices); cultural formations (for example, stereotypes and/or historical portrayals of certain groups as inferior); and structural factors, such as the social divisions that produce unequal relations between members of certain social groups or categories: class, race, gender, sexuality and so on.

Thompson (2003) writes of a 'double dialectic' operating within the PCS framework. By this he means that the personal level interacts dialectically with the cultural level, while the cultural level, in turn, interacts dialectically with the structural level. Let us consider a brief example of each of the two elements:

- *Personal – cultural* The actions of each individual do not occur in a cultural vacuum. How we perceive the world, how we act on it and so on, will owe much to the cultural assumptions we make, the cultural perspective on the world we adopt and so on. For example, while people are not 'cultural dopes' (Giddens, 1979), in the sense of being mere puppets of the cultural context they inhabit, we will inevitably be influenced by the cultural influences we have been exposed to. However, the cultural formations themselves are the result of the continued operation of the 'unwritten rules' on which cultures hinge. That is, while cultures influence and constrain individuals, cultures are themselves the sum total of the actions and meanings that sustain them over time. While it is an unequal relationship (cultures can influence an individual far more than a specific individual can influence a culture), it is none the less, a two-way, dialectical relationship.
- *Cultural – structural* The concept of ideology helps us to understand how the sets of meanings that are part and parcel of cultural formations are closely linked to the wider structural level. For example, it is no coincidence that, in a male-dominated society we have a range of cultural assumptions that reflect and

reinforce a patriarchal perspective on the relations between men and women. Cultures feed into, and help sustain, wider structural relations, while structural factors reinforce and help to sustain the cultural level. Again, this is a two-way, dialectical relationship.

Thompson's approach therefore succeeds in painting a picture of the complexities involved and warns against unsophisticated, reductionist approaches that fail to do justice to the multidimensional nature of the subject. A major strength of this approach is that it captures the complexity – and thus provides an analytical tool for addressing them – but does so predominantly in an accessible style of language that does not discourage people from engaging with the complexities.

Despite the strengths of PCS analysis, it can no doubt be enhanced by a much closer consideration of spirituality. We shall therefore revisit each of the three levels and explore some of the key spiritual issues that arise in relation to each.

### ***The personal level***

The traditional liberal notion of the individual disconnected from wider society is one that cannot be sustained as part of a sophisticated social theory. However, this is not to say that the life experience of individuals is not important, theoretically or practically. To assume it is not important would be to neglect a key part of the overall picture that must include both the individual as a social actor and the cultural and structural context of the stage on which he or she acts.

An important part of the personal level is the notion of personal identity. This is seen not as a fixed personality, but rather as a fluid process of self-definition or self-creation. That is, we need to move away from an essentialist perspective on selfhood that fails to recognize the dynamic nature of identity. A key part of such a fluid conception of the self is the vitally important role played by *meaning*.

We have already referred to the contribution 'meaning making' brings to the contemporary debate about spirituality. As our understanding of our selfhood develops, both internally and in the context of our various relationships, so we are developing, and often fine tuning, our worldview and the meaning that we find and create to make sense of ourselves and our role in the world. Sometimes, however, fine tuning is not enough. We can find ourselves challenged by serious events that happen to us, and if our worldview does not have the capacity to adjust to these new experiences, then we find ourselves with some serious reshaping to undertake. For example, many people who belong to faith communities believe that they will need to expand their worldview to incorporate these new events. The underlying faith of a Muslim, for example, that everything that happens must be in accord with the will of Allah ('Insch' Allah – God willing) means that these new experiences will now be incorporated into a wider, more expanded worldview. By contrast, another person whose faith is shattered by a tragedy may abandon their previous worldview, and replace it with one that is radically different from the one they previously held. There are also examples of people for whom crisis moments have led to religious conversions, adopting (for them) a new worldview where everything is now interpreted for the first time within a religious framework.

These are examples of what Neimeyer (2001) calls ‘meaning reconstruction’. This theoretical perspective is principally located within the field of death, dying and bereavement, and is an attempt to challenge a previously popular approach that suggested a series of stages through which everyone needed to pass before successfully ‘getting over’ their bereavement and reaching the ‘acceptance’ stage. Neimeyer’s approach differs radically from the stages model and underlines the importance of the *meaning* of the relationship to the person who has experienced the loss. This will vary from individual to individual: one person who has been wholly dependent for company upon a pet cat may be far more devastated emotionally by the death of their pet than someone who loses a partner from whom they have been emotionally estranged for a long time. It is the *meaning* of the loss that is all important. In order to move forward, therefore, the person who has experienced the loss will need to undertake some ‘meaning reconstruction’ work. For example, if a couple were used to spending every Tuesday evening visiting various friends, or having them in for a meal, the whole ‘feel’ of Tuesday evenings would radically change if one of them were to die. The one who is left behind would have to find a new meaning and purpose for Tuesday evenings in order to move forward, because the person who was so central to these evening celebrations is no longer around to share it and enliven it. Of course, Tuesday evenings would never ever be the same again; the ache may always be triggered every Tuesday, because some losses can never be replaced. But the process of trying to give *new meaning* to Tuesday, by doing a range of different things instead, will become part of the healing process (for a more detailed discussion of these issues, see Thompson, 2002).

Neimeyer’s approach has a much wider application than bereavement theory; indeed, it can be applied to any situation that involves serious loss. It is an example of ways in which our selfhood is constantly developing, and is being enriched or impoverished by the experiences we encounter. Meaning reconstruction theory has an important part to play in this by reminding us that the links between our selfhood, and the worldview that helps us make sense of what happens to us, are in constant interaction. This is the ‘territory’ that spirituality occupies for each of us, as we seek to identify who we are and what is our place in the world.

### ***The cultural level***

The cultural level is characterized by shared perspectives and thus shared meanings. It is very closely associated with the notion of ‘connectedness’ – recognizing that even the most private of personal experiences is circumscribed by a set of cultural relations based on shared meanings.

An important part of this is the role of rituals. These are institutionalized patterns of behaviour that carry predefined social meanings. A good example of these is the rituals that faith and non-faith communities provide for the rituals of passage, such as birth, achieving adulthood, marriage and death. Here we experience shared meanings and celebrate our connectedness, even if we feel somewhat on the fringes of understanding. For example, a young person attending a Jewish funeral service for a close relative may not fully appreciate the significance of the details of the service if they are themselves not part of the Jewish community. Having a shirt or another article of clothing symbolically

torn as a sign of grief; listening to a liturgy delivered in Hebrew; watching the ritual actions, may not mean very much at all to them. Although it may not make sense at one level, at a deeper level it will be saying something about connectedness and belonging, and that even our aloneness at death has a social context. It is often the rituals that surround and accompany death that are the richest examples of cultural and communal 'meaning making'. There is, for some, a sense of 'this is how we do things – this is the wisdom that has been passed down to us', and that 'we need to get it right in order to do the best for those who are left behind'. On occasion, in some faith communities, this is also deemed to be for the benefit of the one who has died and whose soul or spirit is believed to have gone to a life beyond death. Within such faith communities an understanding of spirituality will pervade the rituals they perform, because the rituals give formalized expressions to the meaning they give to the event.

The difficulty occurs, of course, when the needs of the individual are so subordinated to the needs of the cultural group that he or she feels marginalized or oppressed as a result. Wedding arrangements can often provide good examples of this, where two sets of parents begin to take over the arrangements and shape the event according to their inherited rules and expectations. The 'happy couple' who do not want to 'buy into' this ritual face a real dilemma: to 'go with the flow' will locate them within the cultural norms of their families, but may leave them feeling marginalized when they should be centre stage; but to go off and 'do their own thing' would be to reject the very families to whom they owe their existence.

Disenfranchised grief (Doka, 1993) is another example both of the power of cultural expectations and the ways they can ignore or reject the needs of individuals. 'Disenfranchised grief' refers to people whom the dominant group feel do not have a place within the grieving process and community, or whose circumstances are deemed to be beyond the 'norm'. For many years gay couples have felt the impact of this stigmatizing approach: it is only recently that the formal and legal recognition of gay partnerships in the UK may have begun to change this significantly. People who have had a secret affair with the person who has died will also feel disenfranchised, as will those who have had a secret abortion. These are examples of the power of the dominant culture, and the ways in which individuals can sometimes be discriminated against.

### ***The structural level***

How a person experiences the world will owe much to their position within the social hierarchy in terms of social divisions. There will therefore be significant differences according to a person's class position, gender, ethnicity and so on. Our spiritually significant sense of identity, connectedness and direction in life will be largely circumscribed by such structural factors. For example, our sense of direction and focus in life is likely to owe much to our experiences of education and these, in turn, are very likely to be influenced by inequalities arising from such factors as class (Roberts, 2001), race (Solomos, 2003) and gender (Cranny-Francis *et al.* 2003). Spirituality and social structure are not, therefore, unconnected domains of human reality.

One good example of this arises from our understanding of sexuality. In much of western society, for example, heterosexual relationships have been regarded as the

'norm', not just numerically but also normatively. These heterosexist structures have been reinforced by the major religious traditions – Christianity, Judaism and Islam – whose religious writings, holy books and custom and practice have reinforced these structures by severe condemnation of gay relationships. As a result, gay people have been regarded as sinful as well as being 'deviant' and 'sick'. Consequently, gay people who wish to belong to these faith communities find it extremely difficult to be open about it. They either hide this crucial aspect of their identity in order to be accepted, or they face ostracism if they 'come out'. The current bitter debate within the Anglican communion worldwide over this issue demonstrates the strength of feeling there is over this issue.

One of the consequences of this is that there is an institutional blindness to the oppressive ways in which gay people are being treated. In advocating one style of the 'good life' that many people find satisfying, another style of the 'good life', that is equally fulfilling for others, is vehemently denied. This clearly flies in the face of the secular values of celebrating diversity that are at the heart of much contemporary social work, even though ironically this value base itself has strong religious origins (Bowpitt 1998; Moss 2005; Holloway 2005).

## **Conclusion**

In this paper we have argued for the inclusion of spiritual perspectives in the work we undertake with people in a social work context, and for an awareness of spiritual perspectives in an enriched PCS analysis. By so doing we have argued not only that spirituality is of great importance in its own right; we have also made a case for seeing spirituality as the gateway to the 'heart of helping' and to the gold standard of high-quality, anti-discriminatory practice.

## **References**

- Baxter, E. (2001) *Managing Diversity and Inequality in Health Care*, Edinburgh: Bailliere Tindall.
- Bowpitt, G. (1998) "Evangelical Christianity, Secular Humanism and the Genesis of British Social Work", *British Journal of Social Work* 28, pp. 675-63
- Bruce, S. (1995) *Religion in Modern Britain*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Canda, E.R. and Furman L.D. (1999) *Spiritual Diversity in Social Work Practice: The Heart of Helping*. New York: Free Press.
- Census 2001: Ethnicity and religion in England and Wales.<http://www.statistics.gov.uk/cci/>
- Chatters, L.M. (2000) "Religion and Health: Public Health, Research and Practice", *Annual Review of Public Health*, 21, pp. 335-367.
- Cranny-Francis, A., Waring, W., Stavropoulos, P. and Kirkby, J. (2003) *Gender Studies: Terms and Debates*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Crowther, M.R., Parker, M.W., Achenbaum, W.A., Larimore, W.L., and Koenig, H.G. (2002) "Rowe and Khan's Model of Successful Aging Revisited: Positive Spirituality: The Forgotten Factor", *The Gerontologist*, 42(5) pp. 613-620.
- Fineman, S. (2000) 'Commodifying the Spiritually Intelligent', in Fineman (ed.) *Emotion in Organizations*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn, London: Sage.
- Giddens, A. (1979) *Central Problems in Social Theory*, London: Macmillan.
- Heidegger, M. (1962) *Being and Time*, Oxford: Blackwell (originally published 1927).
- Holloway, M. (2005) *In the Spirit of Things: Social Work, Spirituality and Contemporary Society*, Inaugural professorial lecture, University of Hull.
- McSherry W. (1998) "Nurses' Perceptions of Spirituality and Spiritual Care", *Nursing Standard*, 13(4) pp. 36-40.
- Merchant, R. and Bawn, S. (2005) "Some Aspects of Spirituality and Faith in People with Dementia", Paper presented at the *British Geriatrics Society* conference, Birmingham
- Moss B (2004) 'TGIM- thank god it's Monday'. *British Journal of Occupational Learning*. Vol.2, Issue 2 pp 33-45
- Moss, B. (2005) *Spirituality and Religion*, Lyme Regis: Russell House Publishing.
- Neimeyer R. (ed.) (2001) *Meaning Reconstruction and the Experience of Loss*, Washington DC: American Psychological Association.
- Parsloe, P. (1999) "Some Spiritual and Ethical Issues in Community Care for Frail Elderly People: A Social Work View", in Jewell, A. (ed.) *Spirituality and Ageing*, London: Jessica Kingsley.
- Roberts, K. (2001) *Class in Modern Britain*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Sartre, J-P. (1963) *Search for a Method*, New York: Vintage.
- Sheridan, M. (2004) "Predicting the Use of Spiritually-derived Interventions in Social Work Practice: A Survey of Practitioners", *Journal of Religion and Spirituality in Social Work*, 23(4).
- Solomos, J. (2003) *Race and Racism in Contemporary Britain*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edn, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Stones, R. (2005) *Structuration Theory*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Thompson, N. (1993) *Anti-Discriminatory Practice*, Basingstoke: Macmillan – now Palgrave Macmillan (4<sup>th</sup> edn, 2006).
- Thompson, N. (2003) *Promoting Equality: Tackling Discrimination and Oppression*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Thompson, N. (2005a) "Equality and Diversity: Making Training and Development Count", *British Journal of Occupational Learning* 3(2) (downloadable from [www.neilthompson.info](http://www.neilthompson.info)).
- Thompson, N. (2005b) *Promoting Equality, Valuing Diversity: A Training Resource Pack*, Wrexham: Learning Curve Publishing.
- Thompson, N. (ed.) (2002) *Loss and Grief: A Guide for Human Services Practitioners*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wright S.G. (2002) "Dying to Take Care of You", Royal College of Psychiatrists, Spirituality Special Interest Group, Newsletter No.7.
- Zohar, D. and Marshall, I. (2000) *Spiritual Intelligence*, London: Bloomsbury.
- Zohar, D. and Marshall, I. (2004) *Spiritual Capital: Wealth We Can Live By*, London, Bloomsbury.